

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are currently pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 19-26 stand objected to because of certain informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claim 19 to obviate the noted informality and therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 7, 16, and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. With respect to claims 7 and 16, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position for the following reasons. In particular, it is well recognized that claims set forth the minimum elements required to constitute infringement and that dependent claims are designed to narrow the limitations of the claim(s) from which they depend. Accordingly, in the case of claim 7, claim 1 includes the limitation "selecting at least one input file." This limitation is equivalent to "one or more input files." Claim 7 further narrows the subject limitation to require that "at least one" comprises "at least two." Similarly, with respect to claim 12, the language "the application file comprises at least two separate application files" further limits the language of claim 10, which requires, at a minimum, an application file. Again, because this is a minimum requirement, "an application file" is equivalent to "at least one" or "one or more application files;" therefore, claim 10 further narrows the subject limitation to require that "the application file" comprises at least two such files. Accordingly, both claim 7 and claim 12 comply with the requirements of section 112, second paragraph, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the subject rejection thereof.

With regard to claims 20-26, Applicants have amended those claims to replace "the computer-implemented method" with "the system," thereby overcoming the grounds for rejection. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the subject rejection be withdrawn.

In response, Applicants have amended the claims to address the issues identified by the Examiner and therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-14, 16 and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lu et al., "B2B in TSMC Turnkey Services" (hereinafter "Lu"). In response, Applicants submit that the cited reference fails to anticipate subject claims for at least the following reasons.

In particular, claim 1, as amended, requires *inter alia*:

*selecting at least one of a plurality of input files;*

*selecting an output file format from a plurality of output file formats;*

*selecting a mode for circulation from a plurality of modes for circulation;*

The Examiner cites the third paragraph on the left column of page 41 and the fifth paragraph on the right column of page 41 as disclosing "selecting at least one of a plurality of input files." In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position and submit that the cited text teaches, at best, entry of INSLIP data, which is clearly not equivalent to selecting at least one of a plurality of input files. With regard to "selecting an output file format from a plurality of output file formats," the Examiner cites the last paragraph on the right column of page 43 through the first paragraph on the left column of page 44 as teaching this element. The cited text teaches sending data in a single predetermined format; it clearly fails to teach selection of an output file format from a plurality of available formats. Similarly, with regard to "selecting a mode for circulation . . .", the cited text (the last paragraph on the right column of page 43 though the first paragraph on the left column of page 44) teaches only a single mode for circulation, rather than selection of one mode from a plurality thereof.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that Lu fails to anticipate claim 1 and the subject rejection should therefore be withdrawn. Independent claims 10 and 19 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1 in this regard and is therefore also deemed to be allowable over Lu. Claims 2-5, 7, 11-14, 16, and 20-23 depend from and further limit claims 1, 10, and 19 and are therefore also deemed to be in condition for allowance for at least that reason.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6, 8-9, 15, 17-18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,414 to Nicholls et al. (hereinafter "Nicholls"). In response, Applicants submit that, in view of the fact that claims 6, 8-9, 15, 17-18, and 24-26 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the claims are deemed to be in condition for allowance for at least that reason.

**Conclusion**

For at least the reasons set forth in detail above, all of the pending claims are now deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the pending rejections and issue a formal notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David M. O'Dee  
Registration No. 42,044

Date: 1-12-09

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700  
Dallas, Texas 75219  
Telephone: 214/651-5896  
Facsimile: 214-200-0853

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web System on 1-12-09

Bonnie Boyle  
Name